

VZCZCXRO2060
OO RUEHAG RUEHDBU RUEHFL RUEHKW RUEHLA RUEHMRE RUEHNP RUEHPW RUEHROV
RUEHSR
DE RUEHNO #0238/01 1561951
ZNY CCCCC ZZH
O 051951Z JUN 09
FM USMISSION USNATO
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3043
INFO RUCNAFG/AFGHANISTAN COLLECTIVE PRIORITY
RUCNMEM/EU MEMBER STATES COLLECTIVE PRIORITY
RUEHZL/EUROPEAN POLITICAL COLLECTIVE PRIORITY
RUEHZG/NATO EU COLLECTIVE PRIORITY
RUCNOSC/ORG FOR SECURITY CO OP IN EUR COLLECTIVE PRIORITY
RUEHAD/AMEMBASSY ABU DHABI PRIORITY 0188
RUEHDS/AMEMBASSY ADDIS ABABA PRIORITY 0483
RUEHBY/AMEMBASSY CANBERRA PRIORITY 0597
RUEHIL/AMEMBASSY ISLAMABAD PRIORITY 0762
RUEHKKH/AMEMBASSY KHARTOUM PRIORITY 0556
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY 6396
RUEHUL/AMEMBASSY SEOUL PRIORITY 0576
RUEHGP/AMEMBASSY SINGAPORE PRIORITY 0373
RUEHSI/AMEMBASSY TBILISI PRIORITY 5778
RUEHKO/AMEMBASSY TOKYO PRIORITY 0900
RUEHWL/AMEMBASSY WELLINGTON PRIORITY 0414
RUEHUNV/USMISSION UNVIE VIENNA PRIORITY 0019
RHEHNSC/WHITE HOUSE NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEFDIA/DIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RHMFISS/HQ USCENTCOM MACDILL AFB FL PRIORITY
RHMFISS/HQ USEUCOM VAIHINGEN GE PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY
RUCNDT/USMISSION USUN NEW YORK PRIORITY 0920
RUEHNO/USDELMC BRUSSELS BE PRIORITY
RHMFISS/USNMR SHAPE BE PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 04 USNATO 000238

NOFORN
SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: DECL: 06/06/2019
TAGS: [PREL](#) [NATO](#) [EWWT](#) [MARR](#) [MOPS](#) [AF](#) [PK](#) [RS](#)
SUBJECT: NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL MEETING, JUNE 3, 2009

Classified By: A/PolAd A. "Hoot Baez. Reasons: 1.4 (b) and (d).

11. (C/NF) Summary from the NAC Meeting:

-- AFGHANISTAN: At the June 3 meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Allies discussed continuing disagreements over the scope of the proposed NATO Training Mission-Afghanistan (NTM-A). Secretary General de Hoop Scheffer stressed the urgency of reaching agreement on this before the June 11-12 meeting of NATO Defense Ministers. Most Allies agreed with the Secretary General, with Ambassador Daalder strongly arguing that Allies would not want the headline out of the ministerial to be that NATO had failed to implement a major decision taken by NATO Heads of State and Government at their April Summit. Germany and France agreed on the need to move quickly, but argued that the proposal on the table was perhaps too ambitious and went beyond the summit agreement.

-- BALKANS: The Secretary General urged Allied "prudence" in discussing the transition of KFOR to a deterrence posture, adding that he wanted to avoid the perception that NATO was "running for the exits." (Note: On June 5, Allies agreed a document on the move to deterrence presence.)

-- PIRACY: The Secretary General raised the possibility of a smaller, postponed, or even canceled long-term counter-piracy mission unless Allies stepped up to the plate with force donations at a June 10 force generation conference. Allied responses divided along familiar lines, with EU contributors citing a lack of legal framework as a deterrent to further contributions. The Secretary General strongly rebutted arguments that European Allies could not contribute to both the NATO operation and the EU's Atalanta operation, adding

that he expected to have a discussion of this issue when NATO Defense Ministers meet on June 11-12.

-- IRAQ: Progress toward a long-term agreement with Iraq regarding NTM-I was expected to pick up pace now that Iraqi officials have concluded negotiations on a bilateral agreement with the U.K.. NATO Assistant Secretary General for Operations Martin Howard will travel to Baghdad immediately following the upcoming NATO defense ministerial in order to continue negotiations.

-- NATO-Russia: The Secretary General reported that agreement with Russia had been reached to hold a NATO-Russia Council Foreign Ministerial in Corfu on June 27.
END SUMMARY

Afghanistan

¶2. (C) At the June 3 meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Allies discussed continuing disagreements over the scope of the proposed NATO Training Mission-Afghanistan (NTM-A). Secretary General de Hoop Scheffer stressed the urgency of reaching agreement on this before the June 11-12 meeting of NATO Defense Ministers, arguing forcefully that it would not be acceptable for Allies to fail to make progress on this issue which had already been agreed upon in principle by NATO Heads of State and Government at their April 3-4 summit.

¶3. (C) Most Allies agreed with the Secretary General, with

USNATO 00000238 002 OF 004

Canada making clear that "failure of NTM-A" was not an option. Ambassador Daalder agreed, noting that the Alliance's failure to act in this matter would be the number one headline coming out of the ministerial. Pressing the case, he said that if Afghanistan was the Alliance's number one priority (as Allies say it is) and if training is an important part of how we will ultimately succeed (which Allies again say it is) then the Alliance must move on this quickly and must do so in a manner that sets up as robust an NTM-A as possible.

¶4. (C) France agreed on the need to move quickly, but argued that the proposal on the table went beyond what Heads of State and Government had agreed at their summit. Germany argued that Allies had to look at what was realistic in the short-term in terms of resources. He also questioned whether police training should be done by a "military" organization such as NATO.

Balkans

¶5. (C/NF) The Secretary General reminded Allies that a document on the transition of KFOR to a deterrence posture was out for Allied agreement under a silence procedure until Friday evening, June 5. (Note: This document was agreed by Allies on June 5). He urged "prudence" in public speculation on the future of Kosovo ahead of the June 11-12 Defense Ministerial. He made clear that he wanted to avoid the perception that NATO was "running for the exits."

¶6. (C/NF) A number of Allies echoed the Secretary General's concerns, with Turkey calling for a "prudent and discreet" approach to the media on this issue. Norway stressed that it was important that the Alliance move forward in this matter in an "orderly manner," adding that further steps should not be taken beyond the agreement on the document until after defense ministers had had a chance to discuss the issue.

Piracy

¶7. (C/NF) The Secretary General reported that the force generation conference for a possible long-term NATO

counter-piracy mission would take place on June 10. He added that, based on the disappointing response given at a previous force-sensing meeting, the Military Committee stood ready to "re-calibrate" the scope of the mission downward, or even to postpone or cancel the proposed mission if necessary.

¶8. (C/NF) In the Secretary General's opinion, however, a failure by NATO to establish a long-term mission would leave a "strange impression" with other international actors, including the EU, who were active in the fight against piracy off the Horn of Africa. He added that he would hate to see the day that NATO left counter-piracy to others. He asked if this was the "image" of NATO Allies wanted to project.

¶9. (C/NF) Allies commented along familiar lines: Germany, the Netherlands, Portugal, and Belgium said any NATO mission would need to "add value" to existing counter-piracy efforts, and in addition would require a solid legal framework before more Allies would be willing to contribute assets.

USNATO 00000238 003 OF 004

Meanwhile, the U.S., Turkey, Canada and the UK noted that NATO must be seen to address the piracy problem, which has so far proven bigger than any one organization's ability to deal with. The Turkish PermRep pointed out that force generation was simply a matter of political will. Ambassador Daalder added that, just as he intended was going back to Washington with a request for further assets, so he hoped all of our Allies would do the same. Both the UK and Denmark noted that NATO's most appropriate assets for this kind of mission, the Standing NATO Maritime Groups, should be used to their fullest capacities in any long-term mission. The Canadian PermRep noted that NATO's role in counter-piracy operations would be a proper subject for discussion next week by Defense Ministers.

¶10. (C/NF) In response, the Chairman of the Military Committee, Admiral DiPaulo, said that "value-added" can have two dimensions) the qualitative and the quantitative. He said that any of the organizations and states currently contributing to counter-piracy operations can add quantity. He also said that NATO also has the ability to bring qualitative contributions to the table, such as Maritime Patrol Aircraft. He also raised the possible use of AWACS in a counter-piracy support role.

¶11. (C/NF) The Secretary General strongly rejected the argument made by some European Allies that because they were contributing to the EU's Atalanta mission they could not also contribute to a NATO mission. He pointedly told them to look at NATO naval inventories as cataloged in the regular NATO Defense Planning Questionnaire (DPQ), adding that Allies clearly have more ships than the 13 or so participating in Atalanta. The Secretary General conceded that Allies who raised the issue of a legal framework for a long-term NATO mission had a point, but urged them not to use this as an excuse for not contributing. He said that preparatory work for a legal framework was ongoing, but concluding such a framework would take time. He closed by noting that the piracy issue would be on the agenda of the June 11-12 meeting of NATO Defense Ministers.

Iraq

¶12. (C/NF) NATO Assistant Secretary General for Operations Martin Howard said that he had sent a draft agreement on the long-term status of the NATO Training Mission-Iraq (NTM-I) to Baghdad on April 21 and had received a response from Iraq in mid-May. Howard noted that the Iraqi response was positive, but that the re-write proposed by the Iraqis was "muddled" and vague. Howard said that in order to clarify the situation he had held a video conference with Iraqi officials, including Minister of Defense Abdul Qader. Howard said that after the video conference the NATO International Staff had drafted and forwarded a new version of the

agreement to Iraq. Since then, progress had slowed, largely because Baghdad had been preoccupied with finalizing its bilateral agreement with the U.K. Howard said that progress toward reaching an agreement was expected to pick up pace now that the Iraqis had reached an agreement with London. In concluding his briefing, Howard announced that he would be traveling to Baghdad immediately after the June 11-12 Defense Ministerial in order to continue negotiations.

USNATO 00000238 004 OF 004

NATO-Russia

¶13. (C) The Secretary General reported that agreement had been reached to hold a NATO-Russia Council Foreign Ministerial in Corfu on June 27 on the sidelines of the OSCE ministerial which will also be taking place on the island. Greece said that it was beginning to make appropriate administrative arrangements.

DAALDER